

Record of Interview

Applicants, through attorney Daniel E. Sineway, thank Examiner Thorl Chea for granting Applicants a telephone interview on June 10, 2010, and for his professionalism shown during the interview.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), the following is submitted as a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action. The following statement is intended to comply with the requirements of MPEP § 713.04 and expressly sets forth: (A) a brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted; (B) identification of the claims discussed; (C) identification of specific prior art discussed; (D) identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed; (E) the general thrust of the principal arguments; (F) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed; and (G) the general results or outcome of the interview, if appropriate.

On June 10, 2010, Daniel E. Sineway (attorney for Applicants) contacted the Examiner to discuss the Office Action of March 16, 2010, and potential claim amendments and arguments to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) rejections contained therein. (A) No exhibits were shown or discussed; (B) claims 1 and 4 were specifically discussed; (C) the *Warren* reference (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0115016) and *Ohkubo et al.* reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,118,548) were discussed; (D) amendments in accordance with those presented in this paper were discussed; (E) arguments in accordance with those presented in this paper were discussed, namely, that multi-stage UV light filtering, as described by the present claims, is not taught, disclosed, described, or even suggested in any of the cited references; (F) no other pertinent matters were discussed; and (G) the general results of the interview were that Applicants would present amendments and arguments further defining the irradiating (exposure) and filtering steps in the present claims. In conjunction with those amendments and arguments, Applicants indicated that they would submit evidence of “unexpected results” as further evidence of nonobviousness of the claimed subject matter. It was discussed that such amendments and arguments may potentially overcome the rejections contained in the Office Action, although further consideration and a further search by the Examiner may be necessary.

Appl. No. 10/582,033
Response to Non-Final Office Action
Attorney Docket No.: 22128-71925
Amdt. Dated: July 16, 2010

The amendments and remarks that follow herein are intended to be consistent with the discussion during the interview.

In the event that the foregoing record is not considered complete and accurate, the Examiner is respectfully requested to bring any incompleteness or inaccuracy to the attention of the undersigned.